

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1987

MARIYA YEVGENYEVNA AIRIKYAN,

Petitioner,

RUSTAM V. PACHEV,

Party in Interest,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: February 25, 2015

Decided: March 18, 2015

Before FLOYD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mariya Yevgenyevna Airikyan, Petitioner Pro Se. Joyce R. Branda, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Keith Ian McManus, Senior Litigation Counsel, Joseph Anthony O'Connell, Michele Yvette Frances Sarko, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mariya Yevgenyevna Airikyan, a native of Armenia and a citizen of Kazakhstan, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's denial of her requests for asylum and withholding of removal.* We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Airikyan's merits hearing and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative factual findings, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the adverse credibility finding. See Tewabe v. Gonzales, 446 F.3d 533, 538 (4th Cir. 2006). We further conclude that a review of Airikyan's independent corroborating evidence does not compel a different result.

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Airikyan (B.I.A. Aug. 21, 2014). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

* Airikyan does not challenge the denial of relief under the Convention Against Torture. Accordingly, review of that issue is waived. See Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004).

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED